

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lucas et al.

In reviewing the Specification, Applicants have noted a few typographical/grammatical errors that have been corrected.

Further, Applicants have amended the independent claims (i.e., Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16) to better claim the invention. Particularly, the claims have been amended as shown in amended Claim 1 below:

1. (Currently amended) A method of determining compliance of a received document with data content conformance standards (support is on page 9, lines 16 – 19) ~~receiving a document by a party, the party having a set of policies, the method comprising the steps of:~~

receiving the document;

~~automatically determining whether the document contains at least one standardized specification conformance statement that identifies the received document as complying with a standardized specification that specifies data content requirements for documents containing the conformance statement, and wherein the conformance statement is associated with a corresponding conformance model that identifies the data content requirements of the standardized specification (support is on page 16, lines 19 – 29); and~~

~~automatically verifying, if the document contains the at least one standardized specification conformance statement, that information relating to the statement is conformant to the standardized specification as well as to the set of policies of the party responsive to the received~~

document containing the at least one conformance statement, reading the conformance model to determine whether the received document complies with the standardized specification (support is on page 16, line 30 to page 18, line 6).

Additionally, in view of the amendments to the independent claims, the dependent claims (i.e., Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 15 and 17 – 20) have been amended as illustrated in Claims 2 – 5 below:

2. (Currently amended) The method of Claim 1 wherein determining whether the received document contains at least one conformance statement includes determining whether there is a specific sequence in which conformance statements have to be listed in the document if the document contains more than the at least one conformance statement (support is on page 16, line 30 to page 17, line 9) ~~the verifying step includes the step of accessing the standardized specification and the policies for verification.~~
3. (Currently amended) The method of Claim ~~[[1]]~~ 2 wherein when the document contains more than the at least one conformance statement, it is determined whether each conformance statement is valid (support is on page 17, lines 10 - 22) ~~the verifying step includes the step of accessing a conformance model for verification.~~
4. (Currently amended) The method of Claim 3 wherein if each conformance statement is not valid, an error statement is generated and returned (support is on page 18, lines 1 - 6) ~~the conformance model includes at least one conformance statement required in the document.~~

5. (Currently amended) The method of Claim [[3]] 2 wherein if, in response to determining that there is a specific sequence in which conformance statements have to be listed in the document when the document contains more than the at least one conformance statement, an error statement is generated and returned if the conformance statements are not listed in the specific sequence (support is on page 18, lines 1 - 6) the conformance model includes a plurality of conformance statements in a sequence that is required to be in the document in the same sequence.

Note that support for all added limitations is in the originally-filed Specification. Hence, no new matter is added to the Application.

For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the applied reference. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The present invention provides a method of determining compliance of a received document with data content conformance standards. In accordance with the teachings of the invention, when a document is received, it is checked to determine whether it contains at least one conformance statement that identifies the received document as complying with a standardized specification that specifies data content requirements for documents containing the conformance statement. If so, the conformance model is read to determine whether the received document complies with the standardized specification.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method of determining compliance of a received document with data content conformance standards comprising:
receiving the document;
determining whether the document contains at least one conformance statement that identifies the received document as complying with a standardized

specification that specifies data content requirements for documents containing the conformance statement, and wherein the conformance statement is associated with a corresponding conformance model that identifies the data content requirements of the standardized specification; and responsive to the received document containing the at least one conformance statement, reading the conformance model to determine whether the received document complies with the standardized specification. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that the claims, as presently drafted, are not anticipated by Lucas et al.

Lucas et al. purport to teach a system for manipulating data representation language based-objects in a native programming language environment. According to the teachings of Lucas et al., the system is used to map data objects of the data representation language to corresponding objects within the native programming language and vice versa. The system is equipped to receive a mapping definition mapping selected elements of a data representation language, such as an XML data structure, to selected objects of a programming language, such as ECMAScript. The system is further equipped to determine whether the mapping definition comprises one or more definitional statements expressed with data representation language oriented language elements of a programming language. Further, the system is equipped to process the mapping definition statements comprising data representation language oriented language elements of the programming language, in accordance with syntactical and semantic definitions of the data representation language oriented language elements.

Thus, Lucas et al. disclose a system for mapping data-objects from one programming system (e.g., an XML document) to data-objects of another programming system (e.g., ECMAScript) and vice versa. More precisely, the system advocated by Lucas et al. maps data-objects from an XML document to

AUS920030897US1

ECMAScript and uses data-objects from ECMAScript to generate XML documents.

For example, in paragraph [0056] and Fig. 5A, an algorithm (i.e., FromXML) is disclosed that parses an XML document for data-objects embedded therein so that they can be transposed into ECMAScript. In paragraph [0057] and Fig. 5B, an algorithm (i.e., ToXML) is disclosed that converts ECMAScript data-objects into XML elements.

In Paragraph [0060], Lucas et al. explain that Figs. 8A-8B include versions of ECMAScript functions, which have been modified to cause generation of point objects for stores that are indicated as stocking particular products. In paragraph [0061], Lucas et al. disclose that Fig. 8A illustrates the modified "FromXML" function and Fig. 8B illustrates the modified "ToXML" function.


As is well known in the art, the data-objects in an XML document have to be checked for validity before they are used. To ensure that the data-objects in a receiving/generated XML document are valid, Lucas et al. advocate the use of an XML schema. In this case, the XML schema used is an XML schema generated by a product manufacturing community. This schema facilitates verification of whether the XML processing code is valid and whether the XML document being produced conforms to the manufacturing community's specification (see second sentence of paragraph [0060]).

However, Lucas et al. do not teach, show or suggest ***determining whether the document contains at least one conformance statement that identifies the received document as complying with a standardized specification that specifies data content requirements for documents containing the conformance statement, and wherein the conformance statement is associated with a corresponding conformance model that identifies the data content requirements of the standardized specification; and responsive to the received document containing the at least one conformance statement, reading the conformance model to determine***

whether the received document complies with the standardized specification as claimed.

Hence, Applicants submit that Claim 1, and its dependent claims are allowable over the applied reference. Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16 as well as their independent claims, which all include the limitations in the above-reproduced Claim 1 are also allowable over the applied reference. Consequently, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the application.

Respectfully Submitted


By: _____
Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969